

REMARKS

By the present amendment, claim 8 has been clarified by introducing a first absorption axis of the first portion and a second absorption axis of the second portion, and the presentation of the independent claims 1 and 13-15 has been modified by adding indents.

Further, new claims 28-33 have been added. Support for the recitations in the new claims is found in particular on page 7, lines 16-19 (claims 28-29), page 12, lines 35-36 and page 13, lines 11-12 (claim 30), page 13, lines 12-13 (claim 31), and page 4, lines 30-35, the Examples, and the Figures (claims 32-33).

Claims 1-33 are pending in the present application. Independent claim 1, and claims 2-12, 16-20, and 28-33 dependent directly or indirectly thereon, are directed to an optical film. Independent claims 13-15, and 21-27 dependent directly or indirectly thereon, are directed to a liquid crystal display.

As a preliminary, in the Office Action, it is alleged that a non-compliant Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) was filed on August 5, 2003. However, it is submitted that no IDS was filed on August 5, 2003, but rather, an Office Action was sent by the Examiner on that date, to which Applicants responded on November 5, 2003.

Further, in the Office Action, the specification is objected to for lack of the term “absorption axis” as recited in claim 8.

The objection is respectfully traversed. The term “absorption axes” of claim 8 is particularly mentioned in the specification on page 3, lines 25-26. For further clarification, claim 8 has now been amended to introduce a first absorption axis of the first portion and a second absorption axis of the second portion, to which the term “absorption axes” refers.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the objection should be withdrawn.

Next, in the Office Action, claims 1-7, 11-13-15, 17-20, 22, 24, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over JP 6-59123 (Yoshimi), claims 8-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Yoshimi in view of US 6,498,633 to Ozeki et al. (Ozeki), and claims 12, 16, 21, 23, 25, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Yoshimi in view of US 6,088,079 to Kameyama et al. (Kameyama).

The rejections are respectfully traversed. Contrary to the interpretation apparently taken by the Examiner, Yoshimi does not teach or suggest a structure in which two polarizers are laminated on one side of a liquid crystal cell. Rather, Yoshimi discloses a conventional liquid crystal cell with a front polarizer and a rear polarizer, as shown in the Figures of Yoshimi.

In particular, the phrase "even if there are few polarization films" in the machine-translation of paragraph [0005] of Yoshimi is erroneous. Applicants submit that an more accurate translation of the entire paragraph [0005] is as follows:

[0005]

[Means for solving problem]

The present invention provides a polarizing plate including a transparent protective film on at least one side of a polarizing film and having a visible light transmittance of 35% of more, wherein a polarization degree P satisfies a formula: $P = \sqrt{\frac{(T_p - T_c)}{(T_p + T_c)}} \geq 0.990$ (wherein T_p denotes a parallel transmittance, and T_c denotes an orthogonal transmittance) and a dimensional change rate when being heated at 80°C is 0.3% or less; a polarizing plate in which at least one retardation plate is laminated on one side of the above-mentioned polarizing plate; and a liquid crystal display on which the polarizing plate is disposed on at least one side of the liquid crystal cell. (Emphasis added.)

Thus, Yoshimi does not suggests a plurality of polarizers but applying a protective film or a plurality of protective films to a conventional single polarizing film.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the rejections should be withdrawn.

In conclusion, the invention as presently claimed is patentable. It is believed that the claims are in allowable condition and a notice to that effect is earnestly requested.

In the event there is, in the Examiner's opinion, any outstanding issue and such issue may be resolved by means of a telephone interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicants hereby petition for an appropriate extension of the response period. Please charge the fee for such extension and any other fees which may be required to our Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP



Nicolas E. Seckel
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 44,373

Atty. Docket No. 020582

1250 Connecticut Avenue NW Suite 700

Washington, D.C. 20036

Tel: (202) 822-1100

Fax: (202) 822-1111

Customer No.: 38834

NES:rep